





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS









*THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION  
IN OXFORD, THE BETRAYAL OF  
A SACRED TRUST:—*

*Words of Warning to the University.*

---

A SERMON

PREACHED BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

AT S. MARY-THE-VIRGIN'S,

On the Sunday next before Advent,

(NOVEMBER 21<sup>st</sup>, 1880,)

BY

JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, B.D.

DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

Published by Request.

PARKER AND CO.

OXFORD, AND 6, SOUTHAMPTON-STREET, STRAND,  
LONDON.

## PREFATORY.

THE title originally adopted for the ensuing Sermon, expressive of the occasion for which it was written, (for this is "*the Pride Sermon*,") was—RELIGIOUS OBEDIENCE THE CONDITION OF INTELLECTUAL PROGRESS. Another title is substituted, as better expressing the object with which, at the request of many persons, the Sermon is now published. I desire to point out that THE DIS-ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION IN OXFORD is nothing else but THE BETRAYAL OF A SACRED TRUST: and I offer these as WORDS OF WARNING TO THE UNIVERSITY.

Not unaware am I that, as the ages roll out, it will sometimes happen that Endowments left for one good purpose must needs be diverted to another,—or else must be wasted. As when a few years ago it was ordered that a fund anciently created “for the Redemption of Captives” should be applied to some other object of Christian benevolence: the practice of privateering in the Mediterranean having long since ceased.

But no such plea can be urged in defence of the proposed scheme for the alienation to secular purposes of endowments entrusted to Colleges *for the support of Religion.*

Concerning such endowments, (I say,) no plea of effete or superannuated purpose can be set up; RELIGION being every whit as necessary for the soul of Man at the present instant as it was half a thousand years ago. Rather is

The Deanery  
Chichester

Jan 23  
W.D.

Dear Mr. Talbot

This will interest you. By  
angle an angle copy of it. As the  
subject darkness all mystery, I can  
scarcely describe. Dark myself - Within  
an understanding? A copy of 1860  
is no recognizable in a copy of 1880.

I venture to hope that even  
for something may be done to stem  
the flood - but the relief can  
only come from such a journey.

will you see if any can  
be done? At least, let it  
be started!

Especially considerate or I  
feel at the end of writing up  
articles or L. 39 or my  
Lemon.

most faithfully

L W Burgey

every whit as necessary for the soul of Man at the present instant as it was half a thousand years ago. Rather is

I will now give in the  
names of some of the ~~most~~<sup>more</sup> faithful  
Angels in the Army of  
Commons.

I know of only Burgess & Spe-  
er & Hubbard.

If I know of a dozen or two  
more, I w<sup>t</sup>. do justice  
then.

every whit as necessary for the soul of Man at the present instant as it was half a thousand years ago. Rather is

it the fact that there never was a time since this University became famous when the necessity was so keenly felt as now for interposing barriers in the way of the rapidly-advancing flood of Unbelief and Misbelief. At such a time, what else but madness were the de-Christianizing of Oxford,—whither the flower of England's future Manhood resort to be educated?

But the point to which special attention is invited, is this:—That inasmuch as College endowments—fenced about with safeguards which the Founders themselves deemed impregnable—were given, accepted, and have ever since been held, expressly for the support of Religion, not only in Oxford but throughout the length and breadth of the Land;—now at last to divert these to secular uses were nothing else but *the Betrayal of a Sacred Trust.* (“Will a man rob GOD?”) It is feared that such a crime must not only bring down a curse on every College which so shamefully sets at defiance its most solemn obligations,—(“for the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it;”)—but will entail calamitous consequences on this whole Church and Nation.

For myself—*liberavi animam meam.*

J. W. B.

DEANERY, CHICHESTER,  
*Advent, 1880.*

TO THE MOST HONORABLE  
ROBERT, MARQUIS OF SALISBURY, K.G.  
CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

MY DEAR LORD,

*When you did me the honour (March 16<sup>th</sup>, 1876) to invite me to become a member of the Oxford University Commission, you were so good as to say that you did so out of solicitude for the interests of Theological Study and Religious Teaching in the University.*

*The appointment was most gratifying to me. I had resided in Oxford for five-and-thirty years: throughout more than thirty of which, I had devoted myself exclusively to the study, and (although in the enjoyment of no Professorial chair) to the teaching, of Divinity. The interests of Sacred Science were and are the dearest objects of my heart.*

*How faithfully I was prepared to seek to justify your choice, the ensuing pages will in some degree testify.*

*On the other hand, that your Lordship's appointment would prove unpalatable to the enemies of Religion in Oxford, I was of course well aware. It did not in the least surprise me to find that it even exasperated the leaders of the party greatly. They were*

fully alive to the fact that so long as your nominee was a member of the Commission they would find it difficult to accomplish their main design,—which was to disestablish Religion in this University, and effectually to secularize the Colleges.

But it did surprise me a great deal to discover (December 12<sup>th</sup>, 1876) that the hostility against me (after having been defeated in the House of Lords) was sufficiently formidable—though it proceeded from the enemy's camp—to induce the Government to exclude my name from the Commission after all; and to substitute other names which, however respectable in themselves, afforded no guarantee whatever that the cause of Theological Study and Religious Teaching in the University would be upheld with unflinching constancy and courage.

The last ray of hope vanished when Lord Selborne the other day resigned the Chairmanship of the Commission, and Mr. Mountague Bernard took his place.

I acquiesced without a word of remonstrance or complaint in the course indicated for me,—as your Lordship, (who was at that time rendering your Sovereign important service at Berlin,) will have been informed. But I find very bitter the tidings that Oxford is all but irrevocably doomed to undergo the very calamity which it was my heart's desire (and I am willing to believe your Lordship's also) to see averted from her.

*Accordingly, having been appointed to preach before the University last Sunday, I availed myself of the opportunity to deliver publicly a few words of solemn warning and remonstrance. These will be found between page 17 and page 29 of the ensuing Sermon,—which I now take the liberty of inscribing to your Lordship, and of which I respectfully beg your acceptance. I cling to the hope that it may not yet be quite too late to prevent the entire obliteration from Oxford of that which has hitherto been her chiefest glory, as well as the true secret of her greatness,—I mean, her essentially Religious character.*

*I have the honour to be, my dear Lord, with great respect and admiration,*

*Your obliged and faithful Servant,*

*JOHN W. BURGON.*

*P.S. I venture to invite your Lordship's attention also to what is offered below (page 29 to page 35) on the subject of the "Unattached."*

DEANERY, CHICHESTER,  
Nov. 27, 1880.

## A N A L Y S I S.

	PAGE
S. John vii. 17 explained and commented on . . . . .	9
§§ 1, 2. Other places of Scripture, which prove that the Intellectual and the Moral Nature of Man are indissolubly connected . . . . .	12
§ 3. Hence the <i>Sinfulness of Unbelief</i> . . . . .	13
§ 4. "Education" dissociated from Religion, worthless: . . . . . but this is nevertheless the method of "Board Schools,"	15 16
§ 5. of "High Schools," and of "Ladies' Colleges" . . . . .	17
§ 6. Recent efforts to DISESTABLISH RELIGION in Oxford . . . . .	,,
§ 7. which ought long since to have aroused the Laity . . . . .	19
§ 8. "Lay Teachers" of Theology . . . . .	,,
§ 9. and threatened Abolition of "Clerical Fellowships" . . . . .	20
§ 10. The plea of Intellectual Inferiority disposed of . . . . .	21
§§ 11, 12. Prospect of a deteriorated Clergy . . . . .	22
§ 13. and the decay of Sacred Learning . . . . .	23
§ 14. An unfair act of the Commissioners . . . . .	24
§ 15. The "unknown Triumvirate" appealed from . . . . .	25
§ 16. Review of the history of the Secular movement . . . . .	,,
§§ 17, 18. Professor Bryce's proposal for Lay Professors of Divinity . . . . .	26
§ 19. The Aliens reminded that Oxford is the genuine product of <i>Religion</i> . . . . .	27
and remonstrated with . . . . .	,,
§§ 20, 21. The claims of POVERTY have been disregarded . . . . .	29
§ 22. and the "Unattached" system is the consequence . . . . .	30
§ 23. which is an essentially retrograde movement . . . . .	31
§ 24. an imposture and a sham . . . . .	32
§§ 25, 26. Why are not these "Unattached" assigned to the several Colleges? . . . . .	34
§§ 27, 28, 29. The subject treated of at the outset, resumed . . . . .	35
§§ 30, 31. Last words of Warning. One last Appeal . . . . .	37

## APPENDIX

	PAGE
A.—Recent action of the University of Oxford Commissioners. Effect of their proposed Statutes . . . . .	39
B.—Efforts of the Secularists to disestablish Religion in Oxford . . . . .	40
C.—Professor Bryce, M.P., and the “Liberation Society”	43
D.—The Colleges, essentially <i>Religious Foundations</i> . . . . .	45
E.—The Colleges intended for the encouragement of Learning in the sons of poor Parents . . . . .	52
F.—The proposed enlargement of the Oxford Professoriate	53
PRAYER used on Commemoration Days at Oriel College . . . . .	55

NOTE,— That the passages of the ensuing Sermons enclosed in brackets [ ], were not preached.

THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION  
IN OXFORD, THE BETRAYAL OF  
A SACRED TRUST:—

Words of Warning to the University.

---

S. JOHN vii. 17.

*If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.*

TO understand these words, we must call to mind the occasion when they were spoken and the connexion in which they stand. At the Feast of Tabernacles, our SAVIOUR was teaching in the Temple. His unbelieving countrymen “marvelled” at His discourse: but their wonder was of the kind which spends itself in profitless inquiry. “*How knoweth this fellow Scripture, seeing that He hath never learned?*” Either there was *that* in the Blessed Speaker’s method which made it evident that He had never sat at the feet of one of their Rabbis;—or else the fact was notorious among themselves, (they had ascertained the point, I mean, by inquiry one of another,) that He had never been a learner in any of their schools. What think you of the suggestion that His way of handling Scripture was so extraordinary,—so unprecedented, yet so manifestly profound and (in the best sense) *learned*, —that a discourse of His carried on the face of it, in the judgment of the profoundest living expositors of Holy Scripture, clear evidence that no human being had been His teacher?

Our LORD’S reply, (“My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me,”) declares the source of that Divine knowledge in Himself which so perplexed His enemies. It is one of the many places—(I suspect we do not bestow upon them nearly as much attention as they deserve)—in which the Eternal SON, the Word made flesh, refers

all that He hath to the Eternal FATHER,—the ἀπχὴ καὶ αἵτια τοῦ εἶναι. Wrapped up in it, yet not of necessity implied by it,—not lying, I mean, on the surface of the words actually spoken,—is the doctrine of the Eternal generation of the SON; whereby He is “equal to the FATHER as touching His GODHEAD,” seeing that He and the FATHER are One<sup>a</sup>. But in the ears of His auditory, our LORD’S declaration amounted to nothing more than an avowal that GOD Himself was the source of His knowledge: that His doctrine was derived immediately from Heaven itself. Immediately after which, comes a memorable saying,—of which the purpose, in the first instance, was, to reveal to the unbelieving Jews the cause of their own present perplexity: viz. the condition of their own hearts:—“If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of GOD, or whether I speak of Myself.” But the words looked beyond the actual occasion, and are an oracle for all time. I take them for my text, not only because they are the words proposed in the first instance to the preacher of the “Pride sermon” (as *this* is called),—being the first of the twelve texts out of which he is invited to make his selection:—but also because they are suggestive of certain fundamental truths which it concerns us of this place especially, to keep steadily in mind.

There is a refinement in the Greek which is lost in the English: a definiteness of meaning which our translation fails to convey. ‘Εάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν is clearly something *more* than “If any man will do His will.” It has been rendered,—“If any man wills His will to do.” But this, though it seems to run parallel with the original, does not represent it quite; for θέλω is not *volo* but *velim*: not “will” but “wish.” One is thus reminded (when is one *not* reminded?) of the (almost) impossibility of so translating the important sayings of one language into another as to exhibit their meaning with perfect ac-

<sup>a</sup> S. John x. 30.—See Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* iv. 1 and 2. Also Pearson *On the Creed*, note (h) on Art. I. (vol. ii. p. 19—21, in Burton’s ed.)

curacy: for of course “wish” could not stand in this place. I suspect that,—“If any one *desire* to do His will,” is as good a rendering of the original as is attainable. I am sure it represents it fairly.

What our SAVIOUR promises therefore is not so much that *doing* the will of GOD—the mere outward performance of the Divine commands,—shall conduct a man to the appreciation of Sacred Truth;—shall bring with it, in short, the best Knowledge:—not so much *this*, as, that the sincere purpose of the heart,—the faithful surrender to GOD of the affections and the will,—shall be attended by this blessed result. As if our LORD had said to His auditory,—“Were ye but sincerely bent on doing My FATHER’S will; truly desirous of conforming yourselves to the laws of Him who sent Me;—ye would recognize at once that My doctrine is indeed His; can proceed from no lower source than Himself.”

Here then we are presented with a truly memorable as well as most important declaration. The words embody the great axiom that the reception of Truth depends on the practice of Virtue. “Mysteries are revealed to the *meeke*<sup>b</sup>.<sup>c</sup>” To state the same thing differently,—a promise is given that the Love of GOD shall conduct to the Knowledge of GOD. It is clearly implied—you see it for yourselves!—that Man’s Intellectual and Man’s Moral nature are indissolubly linked together: are not only inseparable, but are interdependent. [What other doctrine is it that S. Paul lays down with such terrible emphasis in the opening chapter of his Epistle to the Romans? where, after reviewing the degraded condition of the Gentiles, he insists that the reason *why* they became so “vain in their imaginations and their foolish heart was darkened,” was because “*they did not like to retain God in their knowledge*<sup>c</sup>.”] And this, as I shall presently show, conducts to some very solemn inferences concerning the nature of Faith and Unbelief;—as well as concerning the value

<sup>b</sup> Ecclus. iii. 19.

<sup>c</sup> Rom. i. 21, 28.

of attainments in Knowledge, irrespective of Moral progress. It brings to view also a man's responsibility for his views and opinions, no less than for his words and actions. Above all, it explains how it comes to pass that *Unbelief* should be everywhere spoken of in Scripture as *Sin*. But before proceeding any further, let me remind you that the passage before us does not stand alone.

1. "How *can ye* believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from GOD only?"—asks our LORD on a famous occasion<sup>d</sup>. I refer to that memorable discourse of His which is set down in the v<sup>th</sup> chapter of S. John's Gospel,—a discourse second in grandeur to none in the Gospel; and from ver. 17 to the end of the chapter, apparently, His formal Defence before the high Court of Sanhedrin. He thereby reveals to us a secret concerning ourselves: namely *this*—that the disposition which courts honour at the hands of our fellow-men, and rests content with that reward, is hostile to the reception of the Truth; or rather is incompatible with it. The words suggest the remark that "there is scarcely any doctrine or precept of our SAVIOUR more distinctly stated than that the capacity for judging of, and for believing the doctrines of Christianity,—depends upon moral goodness, and the sincere practice of virtue." . . . "My judgment is just," (He had said in an earlier part of the same discourse,) "*because I seek not Mine own will, but the will of the FATHER which hath sent Me*"<sup>e</sup>. What else is *that* but to declare that humility, submission, entire singleness of purpose—founded upon implicit obedience to GOD,—are the safest guides and most effectual helps to the Judgment?

2. And these will remind you of other places where the same doctrine is laid down, more or less plainly:—"The commandment of the LORD is pure, *enlightening the eyes*," says the Psalmist<sup>f</sup>; and in another place,—"I have more

<sup>d</sup> S. John v. 44.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. 30.

<sup>f</sup> Ps. xix. 8.

understanding than my teachers, *because I keep Thy precepts*<sup>g</sup>." It became in fact part of the traditional lore of God's ancient people; for the wise son of Sirach says,— "*If thou desire Wisdom, keep the commandments*, and the LORD shall give her unto thee<sup>h</sup>." And again:—"He that *keepeth the Law of the LORD getteth the understanding thereof*<sup>i</sup>." So intimately connected then is the understanding with the will: so *dependent*, in consequence of a Divine Law, is the Intellectual on the Moral. In the words of Hooker,— "We find by experience that although Faith be an intellectual habit of the mind, and have her seat in the understanding, yet an evil moral disposition obstinately wedded to the love of darkness, dampeth the very light of heavenly illumination, and permitteth not the mind to see what doth shine before it<sup>k</sup>."—Shall we indeed say that Faith hath her seat chiefly in the understanding, or in the heart? Certainly the great Apostle, when he speaks of confessing the LORD JESUS with the mouth, connects therewith the heart's belief that GOD hath raised Him from the dead, as the condition of salvation. "*For with the heart*" (he adds) "man believeth unto righteousness<sup>l</sup>."

3. Now this fully explains why *Unbelief* is everywhere spoken of in Scripture as *Sin*. The doctrine is an unpopular one, I am aware. There are not a few who insist that "a man is not responsible for *his opinions*,"—as his views on religious subjects are sometimes styled: which is a double falsity;—first, because essential Religious Truth is a thing irrespective of "Opinion." Next, because a man *is* responsible for the reception he gives to Revealed Doctrines. The articles of the Creed lie outside the province of Opinion. The acceptance of them is compulsory. Again, the authority of the Bible,—as a message to the soul of Man from GOD,—is not a thing which may be denied. The supremacy of Scripture, I say, does not rest upon Opinion. It claims the submission of the

<sup>g</sup> Ps. cxix. 100.

<sup>h</sup> Ecclus. i. 26.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. xxi. 11.

<sup>k</sup> Eccl. Pol. V. lxiii. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Rom. x. 9, 10.

will,—the acceptance of the heart: claims it as a matter of right. And to reject the written Word,—to deny the fundamentals of the Faith—to refuse the Gospel message, —*this* is to lie under the condemnation of the Almighty, and to incur a tremendous penalty. Hear the words of our SAVIOUR CHRIST Himself:—“Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but *he that believeth not shall be condemned*<sup>m</sup>. ” Unbelief is therefore Sin.—Once more,—“When the Paraclete is come, He will convict the world of Sin, of Righteousness, and of Judgment: —Of Sin,—*because they believe not on Me*<sup>n</sup>. ” The world’s rejection of MESSIAH is therefore even singled out as the type of all offences:—under the one great head of *Unbelief*, I repeat, the guilt of the world is gathered up and comprised. Language cannot be more explicit. And the reason of the thing is apparent. It is because Unbelief is no misfortune or error of the understanding, but the outcome of a sinful heart,—the product of a depraved and a rebellious will. [This becomes apparent from the history of Pharaoh in the Old Testament,—convinced intellectually, yet morally hardened to resist the evidence: from the story of the rising of Lazarus in the New,—after which it is found that our LORD’S enemies “took counsel together for to put Him to death<sup>o</sup>;” and “Lazarus also; because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on JESUS<sup>p</sup>. ”] But in fact, the whole tenour of our LORD’S teaching shows it. “He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of GOD.” Again:—“He that believeth not the SON shall not see life: but the wrath of GOD abideth on him<sup>q</sup>. ” Again:—“He that rejecteth Me, and receiveth not My words, . . . the Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day<sup>r</sup>. ” Only once more;—“But . . . the unbelieving . . . shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone,—which is the second

<sup>m</sup> S. Mark xvi. 15, 16.<sup>n</sup> S. John xvi. 8, 9.<sup>o</sup> Ibid. xi. 53.<sup>p</sup> Ibid. xii. 10, 11.<sup>q</sup> Ibid. iii. 18, 36.<sup>r</sup> Ibid. xii. 48.

death<sup>s.</sup>"—The one clue to all these strong expressions is the same. Recal the parable of the "Nobleman" who "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return<sup>t.</sup>" You will remember that "His citizens sent a message after Him saying,—We will not have this Man to reign over us<sup>u.</sup>" You will also remember that on His return,—"But those Mine enemies" (said he) "which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before Me<sup>x.</sup>"—The rejection of CHRIST is in this way set before us as something criminal: an act fitly punished by death. Not only therefore is Unbelief set before us as an immoral act; but in the estimation of the Great Judge, *the guilt* thereof must needs be excessive also.

4. And thus by implication the popular fallacy has been disposed of which assumes that in order to make men better citizens, you have but to educate them more highly. True, that Education, properly so called, must needs elevate and improve a people. But then, What *is* "Education"? In the words of one of the mighty ones of old time,—"But *where* shall Wisdom be found? and where is the place of understanding? Man knoweth not the price thereof, neither is it found in the land of the living. The depth saith, it is not in me: and the sea saith, it is not with me. It cannot be gotten for gold, neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof. It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious onyx, or the sapphire . . . for the price of Wisdom is above rubies. . . . Whence then cometh Wisdom? and where is the place of understanding, seeing it is hid from the eye of all living? . . . GOD understandeth the way thereof, and He knoweth the place thereof." . . . What time He made His primæval 'decree' for the winds—the waters—the rain—the lightning—the thunder;—then did He fix those immutable laws concerning Wisdom which have determined for ever its nature. "And unto

<sup>s</sup> Rev. xxi. 8.

<sup>t</sup> S. Luke xxi. 12.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. 14.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. xix. 27.

man He said, Behold *the fear of the Lord, that is Wisdom*: and *to depart from evil is understanding*<sup>y</sup>!"

Then further, this grand old oracle does not stand unsupported. Both David and David's son declare that "*the fear of the Lord* is the principal part of understanding<sup>z</sup>:" that "*the fear of the Lord* is the beginning of Wisdom—and the knowledge of the holy is understanding<sup>a</sup>." And when the Preacher has done rehearsing the value of learning and the importance of many a written precept,—“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter,” (he exclaims): “*Fear God and keep His Commandments*: for this is the whole duty of Man<sup>b</sup>.” So persistently is it laid down in Scripture that Wisdom, to deserve the name, must have its beginning,—must be founded upon and must grow out of,—the fear of GOD and the love of His commandments; the *desire* “to do His will”.

Let it only be conceded then that Education must be something of *this* sort,—that the foundations of it, I mean, have to be laid in the Knowledge of GOD,—and that the Fear of GOD must be its guiding principle,—and we shall be entirely agreed as to the benefits of Education. There will remain no doubt on either side, that it must prove the great instrument for raising the character of a people. And until quite lately, such was indeed the national theory of Education among ourselves. Until yesterday, Education professedly conducted without Religion would have been deemed disreputable. But it is becoming the prevailing fashion now. It is only necessary to enter one of our “Board-Schools,” to convince oneself that,—for whatever reason,—(and it is a political reason, I am aware,)—a divorce has been recently effected in this country between two things which, in theory at least, used always to go together. Our State Schools are Godless. There is no denying it. The system pursued in a “Board-School” is based on the proscription of the Bible,—the exclusion of Religion from the educational course. I cannot doubt moreover that herein the spirit

<sup>y</sup> Job xxviii. 12—28.

<sup>a</sup> Prov. ix. 10.

<sup>z</sup> Ps. cxi. 10. Prov. i. 7.

<sup>b</sup> Eccles. xii. 13.

of the age is faithfully reflected ; the mind of the nineteenth Century is exhibited truly.

5. But you need not resort to a State-paid School in order to witness the operation of the same principle. Our "High Schools," (as they are called,) are without any *distinctive Religious Teaching*. The Church Catechism—*the very Creed*—is not taught in such Institutions. "All that kind of thing, all Church Doctrine," (say the promoters of these Schools), "we resign to the Parents. Christian Truth must be taught at home."—The plea is plausible : but it will not bear examination. First, because in the case of a vast proportion of your pupils, the result will certainly be that "the Faith" will never be taught at all. Next and chiefly, because there should be no such complete severance between two things which, if they are to be taught effectually, ought to be taught together ; to run into and to colour, in fact to interpenetrate and to leaven one another.—Then, there are Colleges for girls of an older growth ; from which also definite Religious teaching is jealously excluded. And this is a system which I regard with especial disfavour,—let me rather say, with most alarm of all : for what else is such a training of those Women who are to become the teachers of the next generation,—but a poisoning of the sacred springs of our national life at its very fountain-head ?

We do not need however to look so far as "Board-Schools" for the children of the poor,—"High Schools" for girls,—or "Ladies' Colleges,"—in order to convince oneself that a theory of Education, the very opposite of that which is embodied in the precept, "The Fear of the LORD is the beginning of Wisdom,"—just now prevails ; prevails most fatally here in Oxford. This is a subject which I find it impossible to handle without more than usual earnestness—the deepest seriousness and solemnity. ,

6. For in fact, the sum of the recent, as well as of the pending Legislation for this loved place, may be described as a determined effort to "DISESTABLISH RELIGION IN

THE UNIVERSITY<sup>c.</sup>." To abolish Clerical Fellowships :—to abolish Clerical Headships :—to introduce the "lay" teaching of Theology :—to substitute lay for Episcopal Visitors :—these, which (I learn) are the changes chiefly aimed at by the dominant party, amount to nothing else but a scheme for confiscating endowments expressly set apart for the encouragement of Sacred Learning ;—a scheme for secularizing Institutions essentially Religious in their character, which for half a thousand years have exercised over Society an unmixed influence for good ; by providing for the Christian training of the Youth of England, no matter *what* their subsequent destination in life. Quite impossible is it to overlook the true character of this movement. Hostility to the Church as a Divine institution :—an undisguised impatience of those restraints which are the only remaining guarantee that as many as resort hither for education, shall be Christianly brought up :—an invincible repugnance to that distinctive teaching which results inevitably from the fact that the Church is the divinely appointed depositary of a body of revealed Truth, —and without which our Colleges must soon degenerate into a very Babel of discordant voices, and in the end become schools for every form of disbelief :—these, *these* are the principles—(if principles they can be called)—which are threatening at this time to rob Oxford of what yet remains to her of her ancient boast and glory. Most unmistakably is this apparent in the anxiety manifested to substitute lay for Episcopal Visitors of the several Colleges : for what else *can* be the motive of this but the discovery that a Bishop is an over-faithful watch-dog,—whom there is no persuading to connive at sacrilege ; no inducing to betray his trust ? The plea that "the functions of the Visitor being *chiefly judicial*, it is expedient that they should be vested in a person having the qualifications which accompany high judicial office,"—has been already triumphantly disposed of<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> Words actually used in Congregation (27 Jan. 1872) by a distinguished Member of the University. See the Appendix (B).

<sup>d</sup> See *A Letter to the Members of Lincoln College, Oxford, on certain proposed*

7. I am surprised that the great body of our English laity have not long since caused their voices to be heard in this behalf; seeing that this is essentially a Parents' question. Sure am I that if the Fathers of those who send their Sons hither could be singly interrogated as to the kind of influences under which they would themselves desire that those Sons should be trained for the battle of life, there would scarcely be one dissentient voice in the general repudiation of a system which can only be described as un-Christian and ungodly.—Once determine that henceforth the Headships of the Colleges shall be held by laymen,—and you have parted with your only remaining guarantee for the Christian character of the system which will henceforth be pursued in every College. [The Founders designed them to be *Religious Institutions*<sup>e</sup>. But for the maintenance of their Religious character, it is obvious that the Head ought to be qualified to preach the Word of GOD, and to administer the Holy Communion to those who are committed to his charge, and of whom he will have to give an account hereafter; as well as that he should thus be reminded of his own sacred duties towards them<sup>f</sup>. Once enact that your Heads of Houses may be laymen, and you also enact that they *need not even be Christians*,—for recent Legislation has swept away every guarantee. “By the direct operation of the third clause of the Tests’ Act,—(no declaration of Religious Belief being any longer allowed to be made at the taking of any Degree other than Degrees in Divinity,)—the security for sound Religious teaching which such a declaration would afford, can only be given by persons entering into Holy Orders<sup>g</sup>.”]

8. Proceed to introduce “Lay teachers” of Theology, and you will inevitably poison the very fountains at which you invite the Youth of England to come and drink freely. [Such a proposal could only have originated with men who

*changes in their College, by [Chr. Wordsworth] the Bp. of Lincoln, Visitor of the College,—1880.* page 7—10. • See Appendix (D).

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid.* p. 10. <sup>b</sup> *The Provost of Oriel to the Commissioners,* (March 5<sup>th</sup>. 1879), p. 6.—The reader is invited to refer to Appendix (A), further on.

failed to perceive that Theology stands on a distinct platform from every other Science. It is in the first instance not a Discovery but a *Revelation*: and its successful cultivation, while it requires loftier and more diversified attainments than any other Science which can be named, must needs be carried on by quite different methods. Woe to him who supposes that some familiarity with the learned languages and plenty of self-reliance, will qualify him to become a teacher of Divinity! A profound acquaintance with the contents of GOD's written Word, as those blessed pages have been interpreted by the universal Church,—is the first condition of success. To state the matter differently,—To be a competent teacher of Divinity, a man had need to be an accomplished Divine. The very subject-matter of the Science to which he must henceforth dedicate all his powers is the Knowledge of GOD: and this is the most serious consideration of all,—because it follows directly from it that the erroneous teaching of Theology imperils human souls. *Who* in his sane mind would adventure so terrible an experiment? especially in an University which has already parted with every guarantee that the "lay" teacher of Theology shall be so much as a believer in our LORD JESUS CHRIST.]

9. Go on further to abolish "Clerical Fellowships," (as they are now called,) and,—besides the injustice you do to the Clergy, by diverting from them endowments which for centuries have been theirs, and of which they never stood more in need than now<sup>h</sup>,—you deprive yourselves

<sup>h</sup> "Our contention is, that existing Clerical Fellowships and Headships are benefits in the possession of the Church of England, *which are rightly and justly the property of the National Church*; and that their retention is not only an act of justice to that Church, *but contributes to the National character of the Universities*. If half (and I believe more than half) of the educated people in England are in favour of denominational education, is it not right that the Church should have at least its portion amongst the Colleges secured to it by the only means now possible,—namely, by leaving intact this connection with the Clerical body? For I need not remind you that the Ordination vows are the only tests now recognized in the older Colleges; and the 'layman,' in the true sense of the word, i.e. *the lay Churchman*, has

of a body of men bound by the most solemn obligations to inculcate no doctrines inconsistent with the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. [To some, this may seem a matter of little moment: but those who are disposed to look on with equanimity while the Youth of England are being robbed of what is the most precious part of their birthright, are respectfully asked,—In your zeal for the advancement of secular Knowledge, are you not forgetting the national uses of our Colleges as schools of Christian training for the service of this Church and Realm? “The future welfare of England depends mainly on the Religious as well as the intellectual character and attainments of the rising generation, especially in the higher classes. And that character will derive its power for good or evil from the temper and tone of the Colleges in our Universities, as to Christian faith and morals, and Christian worship. The importance therefore of the present work of the University Commission under the Act of 1877 cannot be overrated. The future destinies of our Colleges and Universities, and of the English Nation as affected by them, are in their hands<sup>i</sup>. ”]

10. One argument,—(which nevertheless is freely hazarded in this discussion by those who are for abolishing “Clerical Fellowships,”)—is so utterly hollow and untrue that I will not condescend gravely to entertain it. I allude to the pretence “that Clerical Heads and Fellows of Colleges are likely to be intellectually inferior.” As a matter of fact, *They are not.* Judging from the reason of the case, *Why should they be?* Why should the noblest, the highest, the most difficult of all the Sciences be cultivated by the less intellectual men? Question History, and see whether it be not true that on the contrary, all down the ages, the intellectual giants have been for the most part Theologians. *Who* but Divines have made our Universities so famous? With *whom* has secular Learning and high

become extinct as far as Statutes can make it.”—*The Church and the Universities*, a Letter, &c., by Rev. John Wordsworth, (1880), p. 9.

<sup>i</sup> *Ibid.* p. 12.

Scholarship dwelt conspicuously if not with *them*? The singular impertinence of the insinuation provokes reprisals. I am tempted to invite a resort to actual experience. Recal the University men of greatest mark whom you have yourselves known within the last 20, 30, 40 years: and were they Clergy or Laity? which? Nay, I am content to make my appeal to the facts of the present day. Collect in this place a dozen clerics, and a dozen laymen. And will any one who knows what wit and genius really are, pretend that the intellectual inferiority rests with those who have dedicated themselves to the study of the things of GOD? Our opponents are respectfully assured that they will find it their wisdom to withdraw their immodest claim to a monopoly of intellect; and to rest their enmity to the Church on a plea which may at least be stated without suggesting recollections the reverse of complimentary.]

11. But indeed the whole of the mischief which would result from the pending Legislation has not yet nearly been stated. By the abolition of "Clerical Fellowships," you will inevitably in the end drive away from Oxford the future Clergy of the Church of England; to their own irreparable loss, as well as to the abiding injury of those young men, destined for other professions, side by side with whom Candidates for Holy Orders have hitherto grown up. ["At any time for about ten years back some 550 of our Undergraduates, or *considerably more than a fifth of the whole body*, have been *bonâ fide* Candidates for Ordination. . . . Surely it is the part of a Statesman to encourage this connection between the Clergy and the Universities, which is one of our 'national' peculiarities of the greatest value! The high position assured to the Ministers of our Church, and their insight into the life and modes of thought of other young men, secures them an influence not possessed by the Clergy of other nations. No thoughtful man can look without pain upon the low intellectual position of many of the Clergy in Roman Catholic countries, or on the arid Theology of Protestant Germany

(chiefly under the teaching of lay Professors) which has little or no bearing on personal Religion. From our Universities, on the contrary, a stream of men is constantly going forth, who are at once cultivated and devout. How long we shall possess this privilege, depends much upon present Legislation. But of one thing I am certain, that if the action of this Commission or of Parliament causes this flow to cease, the whole of English Society will suffer; and the historian of the future will marvel at the blindness of those Statesmen, who, to gratify party feeling, sacrificed a national blessing of unique and priceless value<sup>j.</sup>"]

12. I freely avow that *this* is my chiefest dread as a result of the threatened legislation. I waive for the moment the gross injustice of depriving of their own peculiar endowments members of a profession which at this time is only viewed with disfavour in certain quarters, because it teaches the Religion of THE CRUCIFIED. I fasten my eyes rather on the mischief which will result to Society at large if our Parochial Clergy shall ever become a body of one-sided Seminary Priests: narrow in their sympathies: exclusive in their studies: alien in their tastes, habits, dispositions, pursuits, aims. [With the Provost of Oriel, (lately my venerated Chief,) I hold it to be "of national importance that young men of whatever rank or fortune who have the privilege of receiving an University Education, should to a considerable extent be associated together; and above all, that those who are destined for the Christian Ministry *should not be dissociated, like a separate caste, from those who are destined to other Professions, or merely civil duties*<sup>k.</sup>"]

13. I might however, with at least equal reason, call attention to the irreparable mischief which will result to the Realm at large if those endowments shall ever be alienated from the Clergy which were left expressly for their support and encouragement;—on the ground that thereby will have been swept away the very provision

<sup>j</sup> *Ibid.* p. 13.<sup>k</sup> April, 1878.

on which the Church of England has hitherto chiefly depended for the maintenance of a high standard of *Learning* in her Ministers of Religion. And when did she ever stand more in need of a learned body of Clergy than now? It will be an evil day indeed for the country at large when our Parochial Clergy are looked down upon, and discovered to be unable "to hold their own."

14. And yet it is to *this* that we shall soon be tending if this act of spoliation be permitted; seeing that nowhere so well as under the shelter of a College,—(I speak from a long and blissful experience!)—can the Study of Divinity be successfully prosecuted. Screened from anxiety, blessed with leisure, and refreshed by intercourse with congenial spirits,—only there can Clergymen afford to devote themselves to Sacred Learning *for Sacred Learning's sake*. Yes. These grand old libraries and these umbrageous gardens are a very Paradise to the student of Sacred Science,—from which no reason whatever has been hitherto assigned why he should be expulsed.] . . . It is not too much to say that the fundamental changes in our system,—(they amount in fact to a Revolution,)—which are just now being wrought by a little handful of men in a corner; [sometimes, if report speaks truly, *by a majority of one*, but always by a very insignificant majority];—will be felt in their deadly consequences through every part of this great Empire: and will be deplored by all good men when it will be too late to undo or to remedy the mischief. ["A change in the *personnel* of the Commission" at the beginning of this present month of November,—the mere substitution of one name for another<sup>1</sup>,—"has enabled the Liberal party upon it to alter the printed drafts of Statutes which had been provisionally agreed upon; and to reduce the Clerical Fellows at one or two of the Colleges to a very bare minimum<sup>m</sup>." This may be a legal—but is it an equitable proceeding? Is it thus that the Church of CHRIST is to be defrauded of her rightful inheritance by one vote, more or less, in a little handful of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Bradley in place of Lord Selborne. See Appendix (A).      <sup>m</sup> *Ibid.* p. 10.

men whose prevailing object is unmistakably to secularize the University?

15. In order, (if so it might be,) even at this late hour, to avert the impending evil, "I appeal" (in the words of the Bishop of Lincoln) "from an unknown Triumvirate, to all the Members" of each several Foundation "who are interested in its welfare, and have a right to be informed what changes in its constitution are now contemplated." With him, I confess that I experience wondrous little satisfaction "at hearing that the future destinies of our ancient and noble foundations, such as the Colleges of our two great Universities, are dependent in a considerable degree on the opinions and feelings of *three individuals* in each College; who may be excellent men, but who as far as I know are anonymous and irresponsible, and happen to be in favour with those who constitute 'the Governing Body for the time being:' a body numbering perhaps less than a dozen persons<sup>n</sup>.]

16. It is impossible to survey the history of the last thirty years without a sentiment of more than ordinary dissatisfaction.—At first, the plea was urged that Foundations essentially Ecclesiastical were somewhat too exclusive in their character: and the plea was generously allowed. Restrictions were relaxed. Laymen were freely admitted to Fellowships. The curriculum of the University was enlarged.—But soon it became apparent that this did not by any means satisfy those who at first had been suppliants for Toleration only. It was not in fact by any means the thing they really wanted. Tests must henceforth be unreservedly abolished,—which means that, in their view, no one needs any longer to be a Christian.—Finally, it is found that there is to be toleration for all—*except for the Clergy of the Church of England*. As if to make reprisals for the disadvantage under which laymen laboured here for the previous centuries, it is at last openly declared that in the case of certain Professorships hitherto exclu-

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 5, 6.

sively held by Clergymen, "it ought to be, if not a positive disqualification to a candidate, at any rate a disadvantage," that he should be in Holy Orders<sup>o</sup>.

17. [Now let it be stated, in order that we may be clearly understood, that the Professorships which it is proposed thus to secularize are those (1) of Hebrew and (2) of Ecclesiastical History. But then it so happens, (1) That *the only extant Book written in the Hebrew language is THE OLD TESTAMENT.* Next, (2) That Church History, which is essentially the History of Christian Doctrine, is perforce concerned with Divinity throughout. The proposal before us therefore amounts to this: that two of our principal Divinity Chairs in the University shall be handed over to persons *who need not even be Christians:*—"Clergymen of any religious body" being the only class of persons in the Community who (it is proposed) shall be deemed ineligible to either.

18. I am really surprised that *the essential foolishness* of this proposal—(viz. to make "Laymen" accredited Teachers—*Professors* even—of Divinity)—has not struck those with whom it originated. In *which other Faculty* would so monstrous a scheme be tolerated? I have often read—still oftener *tried to read*—"Laymen's Divinity:" and I protest that I have invariably found it simply worthless. A Jurist would probably say the same (and with equal reason) concerning the Legal speculations of men whose training had been for the Sacred calling.—As for "a Faculty of *purely Undenominational Theology*," (which has been lately suggested as the object to be hereafter aimed at,) it is hardly intelligible to me how a man of education and sense—(supposing him to be a believer to some extent in Revelation)—can have been weak enough to deliver himself of a sentiment

<sup>o</sup> Professor Bryce, addressing the "Liberation Society." The sentiment (as reported in the *Nonconformist*) was greeted with cheers by his auditory. See more on this subject in the Appendix (C).

<sup>p</sup> See Appendix (C).

which betrays such entire ignorance of the matter in hand. He either advocates that system with which alone Catholic Antiquity had practical acquaintance ;—in which case, our existing Professoriate will supply him with all that he is in search of : or else (which is the fact) he means something of which Catholic Antiquity never at any time knew anything.—“And pray, Sir,” (I am contented to inquire in reply,)—“what would *you* think of the proposal to found a *Law-School*, of which the fundamental principle should be that the Law professed and taught by its members was to be Law of a kind unknown to any of the Courts,—but which, on the contrary, every Judge on the Bench had repeatedly condemned, and declared to be utterly undeserving of serious attention ?”]

19. The Secularists who broach such views are solemnly reminded that the Oxford which nourished them so fondly in her bosom, and still captivates them by her beauty ;—whose well-stored libraries they find so convenient for study, and whose cloisters furnish them with so delightful a home :—these Aliens are respectfully reminded, I say, that Oxford is the genuine product of Ecclesiastical (*not* ‘Monastic’) zeal,—*Ecclesiastical* liberality and piety : that it was endowed by *Churchmen out of the Church’s funds* : has grown so great and so famous because she has never yet been ashamed to confess openly that the LORD is at once her light and her glory<sup>q</sup>. Every College bears witness to the truth of what I am saying in a hundred nameless ways ; for every College is essentially a *Religious Foundation*<sup>r</sup>. The sweet bells which usher in the dawn with their numberless calls to prayer, attest what is at least the theory of every separate Body. The common Chapel like the common Hall,—and the Tutorial system, which assigns every younger member of each Society to the special care of one of the seniors,—these witness to the theory that the College is but an extension of the Christian home. [The very “Bible-clerk”’s name is a reminder that it was

<sup>q</sup> “*Dominus illuminatio mea*” :—the actual motto of the University.

<sup>r</sup> See Appendix (D).

once the universally enjoined practice to read Scripture aloud during dinner:—a custom which lingered on till 1826<sup>\*</sup>.] There is in the very shadow of these old grey walls a sacred calm which sinks deep into the spirit even of a stranger during his brief sojourn among us: an atmosphere of holiness, I say, there is, which is rather a thing to be felt than described. And if there still survive among us aught of genuine refinement and lofty breeding,—aught of unearthly aspiration and of pure unselfish purpose,—I take leave to declare that it is *all* the product of higher influences than this World is able to furnish. Yes. There would not, believe me, cluster so many sacred memories round every College portal, if Oxford had been a mere aggregate of clubs: if the “roll-call” had always stood in the place of Daily Prayer, and Professorial lectures had been the universal substitute for personal intercourse between the Tutor and his pupils: if,—to state the matter differently, but with more of truth and reality,—if the constraining motive had been away whereby it comes to pass that those especially who have received a Commission from GOD, look on their fellow-men as immortal beings for whom CHRIST died, and for certain of whom they will themselves be called upon hereafter to give account.—Reverse all this:—undo the ancient method which hath prevailed in this place since Oxford became an University:—divorce Religion from intellectual Culture:—look coldly on the claims of revealed Truth:—discourage the best Learning, and drive away those who have every right, human and Divine, to hold the chief place in Oxford:—and all too late you will make the discovery,—(or it will be made for you by those who will curse your memory when you are gone,)—that you destroyed the Institutions which you never really understood; and imparted nothing—because you had nothing to impart—in exchange for the treasure which you threw away.... Head culture without heart training;—secular attainments unillumined by Divine Truth;—even the knowledge of Sacred things, unsanctified by the “desire to do GOD’S will:”—O, all this,

\* From Dr. Bloxam.

depend upon it, is destined to be attended by the same fatal result which followed Man's original transgression. The tasting of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil, apart from access to that other sacramental Tree whose marvellous property it was to repair the waste of Nature and to sustain the spiritual Life,—gratified indeed the bodily appetite, and ministered to the intellectual pride of the primæval pair: but I read that the penalty thereof, in the case of both of them, was *Death*.

20. Enough on this head.—At the risk of being led away from what is my proper subject, I find it impossible to withhold from the Commissioners the further inquiry,— And now, side by side with this unmistakable determination TO DISESTABLISH RELIGION in Oxford,—what remedy are you proposing for a local evil which beyond all others cries aloud for redress at the hands of an Universities' Commission: how is it, I mean, that you propose to deal with the sacred claims of POVERTY:—[intending thereby, of course, not 'Poverty' in the abstract,—but, as exhibited in the persons of those "*Pauperes Scholares*" who would gladly come up to Oxford to receive the benefits of an University Education, could they in any way afford to do so?]

21. Look through the records of those ancient Foundations—with which you display so little sympathy, and of which you seem to have such a very slender appreciation,—and you will find that next to a burning jealousy for GOD'S honour and glory, nothing is more conspicuous than a holy solicitude that the plea of POVERTY shall for ever be recognized in this place<sup>t</sup>. Founded the Colleges confessedly were for the encouragement of Learning: but of Learning *in whom?* *In the sons of poor men*, I answer. None "præter humiles, indigentes, ad studium habiles, proficere volentes," are declared eligible to a Scholarship, (a 'Fellowship' we now call it), in the ancient society to which I myself belong. [And yet, *who* knows not that,—

<sup>t</sup> See the Appendix (E).

from causes which it is needless to specify,—Oxford has become exclusively an University for the rich; and that, save at the Halls—(which by the way, with one exception, it is intended to suppress,)—and at Keble, it is no longer possible to procure the full benefits of an University education, except at a cost which is ruinous to persons of slender resources; simply unapproachable by the actually *poor*? No doubt, if a youth is able to compete successfully for a Scholarship, the case is different: but how can such a result be expected for one who has enjoyed very little training; or rather, has had no early advantages at all? Talk not to me of “*merit*,” therefore. There is *no merit at all* when a lad from the sixth form of one of our public Schools produces a better Greek or Latin exercise than a youth of 20 or 21 who has scrambled into the mysteries of Greek and Latin composition with few external helps, or none.

22. The want of cheaper University education which has been in this way created through the wasteful expenditure of the wealthy,—not to say the thoughtless extravagance of many whose parents are the reverse of rich,—has at last asserted itself so imperiously, that at this instant, out of a total of about 2250 resident Undergraduate members of the University, no less than 245 are “Unattached,”—that is to say, belong to the University without yet belonging to any College. (The entire aggregate of these gentlemen has already reached 417.) A small proportion, I am assured, are men of fortune,—persons, at all events, who because they prefer to live unfettered by restraints of any kind, have adopted the “Unattached” system, of their own free choice. These may be omitted from the account,—with the passing remark that the system was never intended for such as they are: that they ought not to be permitted to avail themselves of it: and that the very existence of such a class of men is its sufficient condemnation. *What* however is more truly to be said concerning the great bulk of those 417, than that they are a standing witness to the insufficiency of our Collegiate appliances,—a proof of

their manifest inaptitude to meet one of the most pressing wants of the day? Nay, the University fails to fulfil the very intention for which it was founded,—fails to justify its very *raison d'être*, in suffering such a body of men to exist. For who sees not that we are at this time rapidly drifting back to the very condition out of which Walter de Merton (*the originator of our Collegiate system*) lifted us in 1264, when he founded and munificently endowed the College which still bears his glorious name, confessedly with the object of putting an end to the "Unattached" system,—which up to his day had prevailed exclusively in Oxford? . . . The case of the "Unattached," I repeat, beyond all others, is just now clamorous for remedy. Rather does *the wrong* of the "Unattached" cry aloud for redress. They already amount to more than a tithe of our resident Undergraduate body. They will soon have grown into a far more formidable fraction.

23. For I maintain that a very grievous wrong has been done to men in their position. Robbed, they have been of their rightful heritage through past Legislation,—ever short-sighted when it sweeps ruthlessly away the provision made in former ages for lending educational assistance to the sons of Parents whose circumstances are the reverse of affluent.] And the question I now respectfully ask, is, —What answer do *you* propose to render poor Scholars when hereafter they stand suppliant at your gates,—suppliant for admission to a share of the high privileges which have been so heartlessly monopolized by the rich? Do you mean—(I am addressing myself to the University Commissioners)—Do you mean still to bid them stand shivering out in the cold, on the plea that *this* time the surplus revenues of the place are required for increasing the incomes of an unwieldy *and a useless* Professoriate<sup>u</sup>? [Lookers on desire to be informed how you propose to reconcile such a course with your "liberal" professions. More than that. You are reported to advocate the doctrine that our Universities are *national* foundations,—which is perfectly true:

<sup>u</sup> See Appendix (F).

and that their revenues are national property,—which is demonstrably false. But approach the question from either point of view,—yours or mine; and—May we be told on what principle you propose to defend the alienation from the Poor of what was left expressly for *their* benefit? also, on what grounds you sanction the transfer to one privileged class, of endowments which were confessedly intended to prove a benefit to the whole Nation?] If, as is admitted<sup>v</sup>, £50 a-year will suffice to enable a man to get through the University on the “unattached” system,—why is not every College with a surplus, called upon, as far as that surplus goes, to undertake that for the same sum of £50 as many as can prove that they absolutely require it, shall enjoy the full benefits of an University education? That those benefits *can* be enjoyed by those who live here in a state of isolation,—ostracized from the society of their fellows,—no one will pretend. *Who* knows not that it is the daily attending the same lectures, yes, and the sharing in the same manly sports: experience of the same Chapel services, and familiarity with the same routine of daily occupation: the dining in the same ancient Hall, and associating with the same pleasant companions:—*who* knows not that *this* it is which makes an University education such a priceless thing,—produces *the Man*,—as well as causes that these shall be the three brightest years in the retrospect of so many an after-life? You cannot seriously pretend that pacing the same streets and gazing up at the same buildings: submitting to the same repeated Examinations and at last obtaining the right to wear the same academic hood:—you will not try to persuade me that anything of *this* sort can in any degree achieve the object with which men come up to Oxford!

24. [It requires in fact little observation and only a slight acquaintance with Human Nature, to be convinced that

<sup>v</sup> “The Censors have collected fresh statistics as to the cost of living. . . . These prove conclusively that the necessary Oxford expenses of a careful Student need not exceed £50 a-year.”—Report of Students’ Delegacy (1877-8),—p. 28.

such a system can never possibly become a real success. Carried out on a large scale,—(and the “Unattached” system already bids fair to develope into a lesser University \*,) —it must inevitably prove in the end a gigantic error. The pinch of grinding poverty, unrelieved by social influences, crushes the spirit, and unfits it for noble enterprise. Meals devoured alone do a man wondrous little good. Solitary walks—moral and mental isolation—the undivided solicitude to obtain an University degree ;—all this kind of thing is a sorry preparation for the battle and the business of the after-life : is no substitute at all for an University education. Weeds which prove ineradicable are observed to abound in such a soil and to wax wondrous tall and strong. It will be an evil day for England when any considerable proportion of her Clergy shall have been educated under such conditions,—trained under such influences. And yet, “*almost the whole* of those Students who take their Degree with us” (say the Delegates of the Unattached) “*become either Clergymen or Schoolmasters,—or both?*” . . . Quite impossible in the meantime is it that any effectual oversight should be taken of many hundred young men living sparse in a place like Oxford,—any real acquaintance obtained with their individual needs and characters. The Colleges should—they certainly *could—help men to be* economical, if the men themselves really desired to be so : should *enable* one who is very poor, if he honestly gives himself up to his work, to live *more cheaply* than in a lodging, on the “Unattached” system, would be possible. And not only more cheaply, but a thousand times more happily. For, to speak plainly, no man is able to live alone. Some, if left quite to them-

\* It has grown steadily from the first. In 1869 the “unattached” numbered 36 : in 1870,—66 : in 1871,—98 : in 1872,—120 : in 1873,—150 : in 1874,—196 : in 1875,—229 : in 1876,—256 : in 1877,—292 : in 1878,—314 : in 1879,—339 : in 1880,—373. They have already (Nov. 24) grown to 417.

† “Out of the 62 Graduates on our books, 30 are Clergymen or Ministers of Religion (some being also Schoolmasters) ; 24 are Schoolmasters or Tutors ; two are studying Medicine, one is a Barrister at Law, one a Law Student, and five only are, (so far as we know), of no profession.”—*Report of Students’ Delegacy (1877-8)*,—p. 5.

selves, are pretty sure to subside into low company,—or else to prove moody and melancholy ; to acquire a moral, or a mental twist : most likely, *both*. . . . The case of the 417 “Unattached,”—(and they will soon grow into 1000<sup>z</sup>,) —claims attention, I repeat, at the hands of the Commissioners *infinitely more than an enlargement of the Professariate*<sup>a</sup>. High time is it that they were all gathered in,—folded like the rest ; and admitted to a share of those priceless benefits which at present are monopolized by a class : reserved in fact for those who are able to produce no other claim for what they enjoy, but that they can afford to spend yearly at least three—if not four—times as much as their less-favoured brethren.

25. There is nothing novel in the remedy proposed above, viz. to connect with the Colleges the “Unattached” members of this University. It is found that in the year 1612, the “*pauperes Scholares*” were a recognized body of men who were distributed over the several Foundations in very various proportions. Ten Colleges<sup>b</sup> are discovered to have supported, on an average, *thirty* poor Scholars each,—the average number of Commoners in those Colleges having been only double that number, viz. 59<sup>c</sup>. By now assigning an average of 12 poor Students to every College, the whole of the “Unattached,” actually resident, would be gathered in.

26. But *by what precise means* the benefits of Collegiate training can best be brought within the reach of men of small means,—I presume not further to indicate. Enough, to have respectfully warned the Commissioners that, merely to tax certain of the Colleges,—and then to hand over the

<sup>a</sup> 417 is the total number of the “Unattached,”—Graduate and Under-graduate,—on the books of the Delegates.—I am indebted for the information to the courtesy of their Censor,—the Rev. G. S. Ward.

<sup>b</sup> The reader is again referred to Appendix (F).

<sup>b</sup> viz. Merton 29, Balliol 22, Exeter 37, Oriel 24, Corpus 14, Magdalen 76, Lincoln 27, Brasenose 17, Trinity 31, S. John’s 20.

<sup>c</sup> Gutch’s *Collectanea Curiosa*, 1781, vol. i. p. 196.

funds so raised, or part of them, to the Delegates of the "Unattached,"—would be only to aggravate one of the most crying of our local evils; not at all to remedy the urgent want complained of. To render eleemosynary relief to "Unattached" Students, I repeat, is *not* to extend to "poor Scholars" the benefits of an University Education. It is, on the contrary, effectually to withhold those benefits from them. It is to raise up in the place an altogether inferior class of men; and to stereotype, as an abiding feature of our system, what was only advocated in the first instance as a temporary measure of expediency. The "unattached" system is an essentially retrograde movement, where we ought to be aiming at Progress: is simply indefensible and intolerable: cannot be too strongly denounced as an imposture and a sham. And it is for Commissioners invested with almost absolute powers to discover the best remedy, before it is too late, for a rapidly growing evil which threatens in the end to affect the character of the entire University of Oxford. They are solemnly implored,—in the sacred Name of HIM who enriched the estate of Poverty with a special Beatitude,—to do this thing; and to do it *now.*]

27. Let me in conclusion, rising up above all this, freely admit that what is at present befalling this loved place,—(my words concerning Oxford have been wrung out of a very full heart,)—that it is but one aspect of a problem with which we have become but too familiar; one more outcome of the prevailing godlessness of the age. "The beginning of Pride" (says the son of Sirach) "is when one departeth from GOD, and *his heart is turned away from his Maker*<sup>d</sup>." The words seem to go to the root of the matter. Pride,—the sin through which the apostate Angels fell<sup>e</sup>,—is rebellion against GOD,—the rebellion of the intellect, or the rebellion of the will: the setting up of self, in some way, against—in the place of—GOD. This is, at all events, the end to which Pride moves; though it may not be the object which Pride proposes to itself at

<sup>d</sup> Ecclus. x. 12. .

<sup>e</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 6.

the outset. The restraints which Law imposes on the exorbitancy of the affections,—the limits which Truth prescribes to the speculations of the understanding:—what else are these but other names for checks administered by the Divine will? GOD,—the Eternal, Invisible, Almighty GOD,—as He is the first Author of Law, so hath He also chosen Truth to be but another name for His own perfections. And it is Man's resistance of the Divine Law—Man's rebellion against some aspect of Divine Truth it is—which constitutes the sinfulness of Pride.

28. At the root of all is discovered to lie a disinclination to conform to the revealed Will of GOD. It invents for itself many excuses,—assumes to itself many names,—puts forth many pleas: but it is still *Enmity against GOD*. To take up certain of our periodicals and to open certain popular books,—to listen to not a few of the discourses of men whose views are just now very much in vogue,—it might really be supposed that in consequence of some wonderful discovery recently made,—ancient beliefs have become exploded: the Faith of the Church Universal for 1800 years is becoming, somehow, a thing of the past. That it is out of gear with “modern Thought;”—out of harmony with the spirit of the age, we do not require to be informed. It seems to be pretended that a new Gospel is dawning on the world: that we are about to enter on a new order of things. But I have inquired in vain for any solid substance which is casting all these fantastic shadows.—We are again and again assured that some reconstruction or readjustment is absolutely necessary to enable the old organization to continue to do its work in regulating men's thoughts and in evangelizing the World. But no proof of this is so much as attempted: no reason for so wild an imagination has yet been furnished,—no, nor ever will be!

29. The one thing needed, friends and Brethren,—(I especially address myself to you younger men, on whom the hopes of England are fixed,—and with whom it rests to determine of what description the Oxford of the future

shall be!)—the one thing required, on your part and on mine, is a renewed and a sanctified will. This is GOD's own appointed guide to the attainment of intellectual Truth. *That beatitude of the Gospel which promises the Vision of God* as the peculiar reward of “the pure in heart<sup>f</sup>,” conveys by implication the assurance that the highest Knowledge shall be the privilege of those who have lived the holiest lives. The *desire to do God's will*, as we have seen, is destined to result in the knowledge whether or no the Doctrine be indeed from GOD. . . . Let *this* then be your practical reply to every solicitation of the Enemy of your soul! Brace yourselves up, on your knees, with the stern resolve to be faithful soldiers and servants of your LORD! Pray, in the language of this day's Collect, for the gift of a stirred-up will: and remember that the very condition of Intellectual Progress in the case of every one of you must still be—*Religious Obedience*.

30. [But I cannot make an end until I have addressed yet a few earnest words to the elder sort,—with whom exclusively rests the grave responsibility of the pending Legislation.—O beware ye of giving irrevocable effect to the thing which ye have seemed hitherto to be bent on doing, but which has not yet reached that stage when it will be quite beyond your power of recal. In your calmer moments you cannot fail to perceive that the course to which you are being hounded on by the enemies of all Religion,—urged by the Enemy of your souls,—is a downward, an impious, a deadly course. For GOD's sake then pause! Have the Christian manliness to make a stand, even at this, the latest minute of the latest hour! Have the courage to refuse to be a consenting party to the ruin of your College; which, remember, is to incur the wrath of Him who describes Himself as a jealous GOD. If others insist on betraying a Sacred Trust, yet do not *thou*! (“O my soul, come not thou into their secret!”) Not in vain, be sure, hath it been recorded in the sacred page that terrible remorse seized the traitor Judas—when it was all

<sup>f</sup> S. Matth. v. 8.

too late. GOD avert from *thee* the guilt of complicity in a crime like *his*,—the misery of becoming a partaker of his anguish !

31. Regard the thing I am saying as you will ; I am far too thoroughly convinced of its gravity and importance, as well as of the truth of it, to withhold a single word. To me—who am approaching the end of life—I cannot express how mad *they* seem who are engaged in the present endeavour to de-Christianize Oxford : for surely the veil has but to be rent away—(it is a wondrous thin one, and *must* be rent away in a few short years !)—and we shall stand face to face with GOD. You cannot affect to doubt how the de-Christianizing of an University must appear in *His* sight ! And O the anguish throughout the long ages of Eternity which *must* follow,—O the gnawing worm, the fiery anguish,—of remembering that in our lifetime,—the days of our probation here on Earth,—we took *our* stand among the enemies of GOD ; threw in *our* lot with the Unbelievers ; were helpful in promoting the designs of those who were for the Disestablishment of the Religion of the GOD of Truth! . . . If there be the shadow of a lingering doubt in any heart,—if the faintest suspicion makes itself felt in any quarter that the sober verdict of old Age will reverse the judgment of early Manhood,—O, as thou valuest thine eternal peace, let the cause of CHRIST and of His Truth have the benefit of that lingering doubt,—that faint suspicion! . . . So may one thorn the less disturb thy dying pillow ! So mayest thou not be disappointed in thy trembling hope of finding mercy in that tremendous Day when it shall be said by every one of us —“I have heard of Thee with the hearing of the ear : but now—mine eye seeth Thee !”]

I HAVE BEEN VERY JEALOUS FOR THE LORD GOD  
OF HOSTS.

## A P P E N D I X (A).

### RECENT ACTION OF "THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD COMMISSIONERS." EFFECT OF THEIR PROPOSED STATUTES.

*Referred to at p. 24: see also p. 19.*

THE draft of the Statutes proposed for Magdalen College by a majority of the Commissioners, *was actually in print* when Lord Selborne withdrew from the Commission. It provided that if, at the time of holding an election to a Tutorial Fellowship, the number of Fellows in Holy Orders holding such Fellowships should be reduced below one half of the whole number of such Fellows for the time being, no person should be eligible but one in—or intending to take—Holy Orders.—This would have secured to the College *five* Clerical Fellows; and saved the Religious character of the Foundation.

The vacancy caused by the retirement of Lord Selborne from the Commission was supplied by the appointment of Dr. Bradley, Master of University. The Rt. Hon. Mountague Bernard now became Chairman. Whereupon, the Secularists instantly reopened the entire question: recalled the draft Statutes already in print; and the next time the College came before the Commissioners (2 Nov.), *by a majority of one vote* (5 against 4) reduced the number of Clerical Fellows to *two*.

The evil *animus* which, in a matter of so much gravity, could thus, *per fas et nefas*, pursue its unholy advantage to the bitter end,—must strike every fair looker-on with astonishment and displeasure. Can it be right, I ask, on the strength of *a single vote*, to go back and inflict a deadly injury on an ancient Society,—against the will of the College itself, and in plain defiance of the ascertained intention of its Founder: especially after it had in some degree survived the ordeal of the Commission?

---

While these pages are passing through the press, a copy of the "STATUTES PROPOSED TO BE MADE BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD COMMISSIONERS FOR" eight of the Colleges, has been sent to every Member of Congregation. They realize the worst fears of the friends of Religion and of Oxford.

They reduce the number of Fellowships to be held by Clergymen, to two, one, or none. They often contemplate the possibility of there *not being a single Fellow of the College* in Holy Orders. They universally abolish "Clerical Headships:" thereby removing the only remaining guarantee that the Head of a College shall be a Christian. Henceforward, there is nothing whatever to prevent a College from being presided over by an avowed Infidel, or by a Papist.—Have English Parents nothing to say

to all this? Are *Christian Parents* prepared to send up their sons to Oxford *without any guarantee whatever* that those sons shall be Christianly brought up?

True, that in every instance the formula (descriptive of the purpose of the College)—“*a place of Religion, Learning, and Education*”—has been retained. But I take leave to point out that after carefully eliminating from the Statutes of a College the only remaining guarantee that the “Religion” taught in that College shall be the *Religion of JESUS CHRIST* (Whom to know, alone, “is Life!”),—thus to profess loyalty to His cause,—to put forward this barren, outward symbol of affection for His person,—is nothing else but *to betray the Son of Man with a kiss.*

The case of LINCOLN COLLEGE is sufficiently remarkable to merit independent notice.

In the Royal Charter of Foundation, confirmed by Parliament in 1427 (13 Oct.), Richard Flemming, Bp. of Lincoln, is empowered “unire, annexere, et incorporare” the three neighbouring Churches of All Saints’, S. Mildred, and S. Michael; “et easdem Ecclesias sic unitas, annexas, et incorporatas, Ecclesiam Omnim Sanctorum nominare: et eandem Ecclesiam in Ecclesiam Collegiatam sive Collegium erigere.”—Lincoln College is therefore something more than *a College of Priests*. It is a COLLEGiate CHURCH. Every Fellow accordingly has his “*stallum in choro et vocem in capitulo*”: College meetings are called *Chapters*; and the days of meeting are called *Chapter-days*.

Will it be believed that, by the proposed new Statutes, no provision is made that *a single Fellow of Lincoln College shall be in Holy Orders?*

## APPENDIX (B).

### EFFORTS OF THE SECULARISTS TO DISESTABLISH RELIGION IN OXFORD.

*Referred to at p. 18.*

I HAD proposed to myself to introduce in this place several details indicative of the spirit of undisguised Secularism which of late years has prevailed in Oxford; but the length to which this Sermon has already grown, and the advanced period of the Term, warns me that I must be briefer than I had intended. I proceed to make some extracts from an Address “To the Non-Resident Members of Convocation,” bearing date “Jan. 1872,” which was circulated at the time among the Oxford Residents:—

“GENTLEMEN,

“Certain alterations in the Statutes of the University, which had become necessary in consequence of the passing of the Uni-

versities Tests' Act (34 and 35 Vict.), having been proposed by the Hebdomadal Council,—advantage was taken of the occasion by the Secularist party in Oxford to attempt to bring about other changes in our Academical system beyond the intentions of the Legislature. Those changes, involving in principle the secularization of the University, are of so serious a nature, that it is desirable you should have a more particular account of them than has appeared in the 'Times.'

"1. Let us consider in the first place what the intentions of the Legislature were. Of these we can have no more competent witness than Sir Roundell Palmer, from whose speech in the House of Commons, as reported in the *Times* of June 14, 1870, the following is an extract:—

'Sir Roundell Palmer said,—

'There could be no doubt that there were in University Statutes, and in College Statutes, provisions which would go a long way towards excluding any teaching which was inconsistent with their Christian character; and it was to be assumed that all who wished to see Nonconformists admitted into the Universities would regret *if the effect of this Legislation were that the Christian Religion was set at naught, and made the subject of attack by Persons holding Offices in the Universities.* Nothing would have induced him to acquiesce in this legislation if he believed that *the effect would be the Secularization of University teaching*, or the production of that licence which would admit of attacks being made, as it were by authority, by those who should be the Teachers of it, upon that Religion which was professed by the vast majority of all denominations in this country. He thought it was a defect in the Bill that it did not deal more boldly with this matter, because the tests and restrictions which the Bill abolished had prevented embarrassment in the Past. He would have endeavoured to offer to the Committee some form of proviso, which without entrenching at all upon the general principle of comprehension, to give effect to which was the essence of the Bill, *would have given Additional Guarantees against the possibility of a School given to Irreligious Proselytism rising up in the Universities,—a danger which he was bound to add was not in these days wholly imaginary or chimerical.* Nothing more mischievous could arise, not only upon Religious, but also upon civil and moral grounds; for if any succeeded in an attempt to introduce into the minds of the people of this country Heathenism as to Religious Belief, he was sure that Heathenism in Morals would follow at no great distance.'"

2. Let us now consider the changes attempted in Congregation beyond the intentions of the Legislature. The Hebdomadal

Council proposed to alter the following important Statute,—by leaving out the words printed in italics :—

“ Item statutum est quod nullus Professor aut Prælector publicus quicquam directe vel indirecte doceat, vel dogmatically asserat, quod Fidei Catholicæ vel bonis moribus ullâ ex parte aduersetur. [Sed contra, quilibet eorum, quoties opportuna ei inter legendum offeretur occasio, auditores suos ad Sacram Doctrinam amplectendam et tuendam, atque ad honeste pieque vivendum, adhortetur. Et si quis eorum Scholares sive auditores suos aliquid minus sane et sincere de Fide sentire cognoverit aut suspicetur, eos admoneat atque ab erroribus ad veritatem revocare studeat. Quod si quis obstinate in aliquo errore perseveraverit, id Vice-Cancellario denunciare teatur.]” Tit. iv. sect. ii. § 3 (p. 60).

But in Congregation, a further Amendment to leave out also the words “*FIDEI CATHOLICI VEL*,” was proposed by the Rev. E. Hatch, M.A., Vice-Principal of S. Mary Hall, and seconded by J. R. Thursfield, Esq., M.A., Tutor and Dean of Jesus College. Mr. Hatch, in moving the Amendment, remarked that “*the time was come for THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION IN THE UNIVERSITY.*” (*Times’ Report.*) The Amendment was happily rejected by 56 votes to 20.

3. The next change attempted in Congregation was, if possible, of still greater importance. The Vice-Chancellor is required by the Statutes to confer Degrees in the following form :— “[*Ad honorem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et ad profectum Sacrosanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ, et studii,*] ego auctoritate meâ et totius Universitatis do tibi licentiam incipiendi in facultate Artium, &c. [*In Nomine Domini Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti,*] hæc postrema dum pronunciat, debita cum reverentia, caput aperiendo.”

The Hebdomadal Council had proposed that in the case of Jews, Unitarians, or others who might express a wish to that effect to the Vice-Chancellor, the Name of the Trinity should be omitted, and the form run thus :—“ Ego auctoritate meâ et totius Universitatis do tibi licentiam, &c. cum ea completa sint, quæ per Statuta requiruntur.”

This seemed fully to meet the requirements of the Legislature ; but did not satisfy the wishes of what is called the advanced party in Congregation, who accordingly brought forward the following Amendment,—“ To omit from ‘ad honorem’ to ‘et studii,’ and from ‘In nomine’ to ‘Spiritus Sancti’ inclusive.

The effect of this alteration would have been to deprive the degree of its Religious character *in all cases, whether parties objected to the Name of the Trinity or not;* and was urged by Mr. Thorley, (Sub-Warden and Tutor of Wadham College,) on the ground that ‘Dissenters’ (i.e. Unitarians, the only Non-conformists who would object to the Name of the Trinity) ‘disliked declarations.’ Whereupon, Mr. Neate (Fellow of Oriel) had the manliness to declare that “ This was a change compared with which the Reformation was merely a verbal alteration. It asserted the secular character of the University, and the mention

of the Dissenters was merely a blind." The amendment was lost by 63 votes to 27.

---

This must suffice. He who would know more of the matter, is invited to refer to the *University Gazette* for Jan. 1872, pp. 33 and 50, with a copy of the STATUTES of the University (ed. 1870) open before him. He will find that, whereas it was deemed "*expedient, in consequence of the passing of the Universities Tests' Act, 1871 (34 and 35 Vict. c. 26), to amend various Statutes respecting the duty of conforming to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, and the Statute prescribing the Forms of Admission to Degrees;*"—the changes actually made in the University Statutes (Feb. 17) far exceeded what the requirements of the Tests' Act implied: and that the animus of the Legislation was unmistakably to get rid of every safeguard; every recognition of the *Religious* character of the University,—every admission that there are such things as Truth and Falsehood in Religion.

## A P P E N D I X (C).

### PROFESSOR BRYCE, M.P., AND THE "LIBERATION SOCIETY."

*Referred to at page 26,—§§ 16 and 18.*

THE following is a condensation of the report given by *The Nonconformist* of Professor Bryce's Speech at a meeting of the Liberation Society,—copied into the *Guardian* Newspaper of 2 June, 1880, p. 707. I simply omit the less interesting passages:—

"MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,—I shall go perfectly straight to the point to which I am directed by Mr. Richard to address my remarks.

"The question of University Reform, in its connection with the application of the principles of Religious Equality, has got a particular interest for us at this moment. . . . The position of things, to put it in the shortest words, is this:—At the present moment the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge are passing—as they are almost always passing—through the crucible of Reform. The Oxford Commission unfortunately was never as liberal in its composition as we could have wished. . . .

"Now, the question which the Commission has been addressing itself to, so far as it concerns us here, is this. There are in the Colleges of the University, a large number of Fellowships, offices, and emoluments. In time past a great many of these were open only to Clergymen. By the last Commission a great many were thrown open; but a great deal too many still remain

closed—that is to say, no one can be elected to them who either is not already (in what are called in the Anglican Church) Holy Orders, or prepared to give a pledge that he will take those Orders at a specified time. . . .

“ Well, we have laboured very much for the total abolition of Clerical Headships and Fellowships; and you will be glad to hear that in most Colleges the Liberal majority among the Fellows is so strong that they have represented to the Commissioners the desirability of throwing open the Headship, and *all, or very nearly all, of the Fellowships.* Their representatives have in most cases been so strong that the Commissioners have generally acceded to their wishes ; . . . but I believe it is no secret that in three colleges at least—Christ Church, Magdalen, and St. John’s—a very considerable proportion of clerical Fellowships has been retained.

“ Now this is felt by the Liberal party, and by those whom we ought more particularly to pity, *the liberal members in those colleges who are going to be handed over, bound hand and foot, to the mercies of a Clerical majority,*—to be a grievous wrong, and entirely contrary to the whole current and spirit of modern legislation. They, therefore, appeal with confidence, as they did in the days which ended in the abolition of University tests, to the sympathy of the great Nonconformist body of this country to help them in their struggle. (Cheers.) . . .

“ One question only remains, and that is one about which very little has been said heretofore, but with regard to which also I hope you will give us your support when the time for action arrives.

“ The Theological Faculty in the Universities is entirely confined to Clergymen of the Established Church. I do not mean to say that *the time is yet come when we can have a purely undenominational Theological faculty.* Therefore, as regards Dogmatic and Pastoral Theology, possibly the only way of keeping up such chairs at present is to allow them to be occupied by one particular denomination ; and that denomination which has them has the best claim to keep them.

“ There are, however, two chairs, two Professorships in the University, both of the highest importance, with regard to which a vigorous effort ought to be made to liberate them from this Clerical restriction—the chairs of Hebrew and Ecclesiastical History.

“ And about Ecclesiastical History I go so far as to say that it ought to be, *if not a positive disqualification, at any rate a disadvantage, to a man who stands for a chair of that kind, to be a Clergyman of any religious body.* (Cheers.) The subject of Ecclesiastical History is one of so much importance and so much difficulty, requiring a mind so absolutely fair and impartial, that *it would be more safely intrusted to a learned and judicious layman than to any Clergyman whatever;* and, therefore, I hope that

some action will be taken to throw open these Professorships to laymen, and that we shall have your support. (Cheers.)

"In the University of Cambridge the Commission has been composed of more liberally minded men, and the prospects of secularisation appear to be better. It is possible, however, that there also *your help may be required*. . . .

"I beg you to bear in remembrance that it is not only the question of the Burials Bill, but also of *the complete liberalisation of the Universities, by which you may give effect to the principles of religious equality*. (Cheers.)"

---

It is convenient to know beforehand, at the hands of distinguished and influential members of our own body, what awaits us. From what goes before, it appears that we are some day to have "*a purely undenominational faculty of Theology*" imposed upon us: though, happily, "the time is not come for it yet."

Interesting meanwhile it is to be made aware of the estimation in which such an one as the Regius Professor of Law holds the English Clergy. Fairness and Impartiality, (it is to be inferred from his remarks,) are qualities to be simply despised of at their hands: nay, at the hands of "*any Clergyman whatever*." But in fact the preceding can hardly be an adequate expression of Professor Bryce's distrust of the race. In three out of the whole number of the Colleges, he thinks, "a very considerable proportion of Clerical Fellowships has been retained." "Now this is felt by the Liberal party to be a grievous wrong." (*Why, the learned Professor has omitted to explain.*) But his pity is directed in particular to "*the Liberal members in those Colleges: who are going to be handed over, bound hand and foot, to the mercies of a Clerical majority*:"—which "*tender mercies*" (we are left to infer) are "*cruel*" indeed.

Are we then to understand that *five Clerical Fellows out of a total of thirty*, constitute "*a Clerical majority?*"

## A P P E N D I X (D).

### THE COLLEGES, ESSENTIALLY RELIGIOUS FOUNDATIONS.

*Referred to at pages 19 and 27.*

IT will not perhaps be a waste of time that I should lay before the Reader some evidences of the truth of the often-repeated statement, that "*The Colleges of Oxford are essentially Religious Foundations.*" Few, unacquainted with our College Statutes, are probably aware of the extent to which those ancient documents, (which I observe with regret it is now proposed to repeal and

set aside entirely,) witness to the *Religious Spirit* which is found to have *invariably* actuated our Founders. I have therefore made a few hurried excerpts,—the passages, in short, which caught my eye in hastily turning the pages of the College Statutes ;—and I now recommend them to the attention of as many as they may concern : apologizing for the many imperfections of my work, and wishing that there had been time for me to make it more complete.

But I cannot dismiss these pages without one solemn Word of Remonstrance addressed to those who are displaying so much impatience to get rid of the record of the Intentions of the pious Founders and Benefactors whose bread they are nevertheless not ashamed to eat ; whose bounty maintains them ; and to whom they are indebted for every blessing they enjoy in this place. Why disguise the Truth ? It is, because the *periodical reminder of those Intentions*,—(for our College Statutes, by the Founder's express command, have until lately been read over in the hearing of the assembled body, twice if not three times every year,)—It is, I say, because to our modern Secularists the frequent reminder has proved unwelcome that the *College was founded "ad honorem Dei, et in augmentationem cultus Divini."* It was inconvenient, (to use no stronger expression), to hear the echo of a human voice, and *that* the voice of the Founder of the College —borne across the gulph of upwards of half a thousand years—addressing the men of the present generation after the following (or some similar) solemn fashion :—

“ Dum labentis sæculi corruptelam in mente discutimus  
judicio rationis, et quantâ velocitate mundana pertranseant  
solicitâ meditatione pensamus, certo videmus certius quod  
fragilitatis humanæ conditio statum habet instabilem, et quæ  
visibilem habent essentiam tendunt visibiliter ad non esse.  
Ad Ipsius ergo misericordiam qui regit quos condidit, cuius  
Regnum fine non clauditur, nec ullis limitibus coarctatur,  
oculos mentis erigimus, et quæ sibi placentia æstimamus,  
votis amplectimur, et desiderio exsequimur vigilanti : Ejus  
clementiam totis cordis viribus efflagitantes, ut nobis in  
presenti ærumnâ laticem suæ pietatis aperiat, et diriget se-  
cundum suum beneplacitum actus nostros.”

After this solemn preamble, follows the declaration of the Founder's intention :—

“ Cum itaque ad laudem Nominis sui, et decorem et utili-  
tatem sacrosanctæ Ecclesiæ sponsæ suæ, statuerimus et ordi-  
naverimus quoddam Collegium SCHOLARIUM IN SACRA THEO-  
LOGIA STUDENTIUM IN UNIVERSITATE OXONIENSI, PERPETUIS  
TEMPORIBUS DURATURUM, . . . Ordinationem fecimus infra  
scriptam, quam perpetuis temporibus inviolabiliter præcipimus  
observari.”

It is of course inconvenient in a high degree to Secularists to have to sit and listen to such a lecture as the foregoing from their Founder, two or three times a year. Hence, their impatience to silence his reproachful accents,—and to bury in oblivion College Statutes, together with the memory of their Author.

But gentlemen are assured that it is *not possible* so to sever with the Past at pleasure; so to efface the record of the intentions of ancient Benefactors. “*Litera scripta manet.*” And not only so, but those pious Intentions themselves are prone to rise up, as from the grave, and make themselves heard reproachfully when men least expect it. The prayers of those many Founders are not forgotten (be sure !) before GOD: nor yet the memory of the pious vows which found fulfilment when they had created this glorious place. All are as fresh in the memory of the Most HIGH as in the hour when they were originally breathed. And—there will yet come a stern day of reckoning (*Nemesis* the ancients called it): for corporate bodies, like nations, are reckoned with in this World,—even as individuals are in the next.

My excerpts follow :—

---

“*Imprimis a Deo, ejusque cultu religioso, uti par est, initium facientes,*”—is the exordium of the Statutes of UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.—The Master must be “*in sacerdotio constitutus.*”—“*Omnes autem Socii dent operam Theologice continue, nec aliquam aliam facultatem admisceant; et intra quantum annum post inceptionem in Artibus, suscipiant Diaconatus ordinem: et anno exinde completo, in Presbyteros ordinentur.*” This College has the patronage of 10 cures of souls.

A religious motive clearly was paramount with Devorguilla, widow of John Balliol the founder of BALLIOL (1282). This appears from the prominence given in her very brief Statutes to the attendance of the “*Scholares*” at Divine Service,—their “*Grace*” before and after their meals,—&c. The Statutes of 1507, which have hitherto governed the society, direct that the Master shall be “*Theologâ doctus, cultui Divino, virtuti et studio, deditus; horumque nutritor et incitator.*” Provision is further made “*ne laborantibus ancillis, id est logicâ et philosophiâ, torpescat domina Theologia:*”—a sentiment which is adopted,—the very words being transcribed,—by Bp. Fox (1517), the founder of Corpus. Also,—“*ne frigescat fervida in Deum charitas abscondaturve talentum traditum, statuimus ut Socii hujus Collegii intra quatuor annos post Magistratus gradus susceptionem ordine Sacerdotali constituantur.*”—Peter Blundell ordained that the six Scholarships which he founded and endowed should be held by “*Students in Divinity.*” The College presents to 19 cures of souls.

Walter de Merton, Bp. of Rochester, the founder of MERTON, in his Statutes (1274) directs that the larger number of his Scho-

lars “artium liberalium et philosophiae studio vacent, donec . . . tamquam in his laudabiliter proiecti, ad studium se transferant Theologiae:”—words which are borrowed by the Founder of ORIEL, and introduced into his Statutes. This College has the patronage of 17 cures of souls.

EXETER founded by Walter Stapeldon, Bp. of Exeter, (1316) is to be presided over by a Rector,—“*Sacrae Theologiae Baccalaureus . . . cultui Divino deditus.*”—“Artium vero Magistri omnes et singuli, tempore suæ necessariae regentiaæ completo, statim ad Sacram Theologiam se divertant; ei tam diligenter operam dantes, ut decimo post completam regentiam anno, promoveantur ad gradum Baccalaurei; ac deinde, ante octavum annum completum, ad ipsum Doctoratus Sacrae Theologiae gradum actualiter promoveantur.” This College has the patronage of 16 cures of souls.

ORIEL was founded “ad honorem Dei . . . et in augmentationem cultus Divini.” It is described in its Statutes (1325-6) as “Collegium Scholarium in sacrâ Theologiâ studentium in Universitate Oxoniensi perpetuis temporibus duraturum:”—in its Charter of Foundation, as designed “ad decorum Sacrosanctæ matris Ecclesie, cuius ministeria personis sunt idoneis committenda, quæ, velut stellæ, in custodiis suis lumen præbeant, et populos instruant doctrina pariter et exemplo.” Of its Scholars, “decem pro primariâ fundatione Collegii illius, . . . studio vacent Theologiae.” John Franks, Master of the Rolls (1441), added 4 Scholars,—“ad Dei Ecclesiam et Cleri augmentum:” and Bp. Smith (1507), one more,—“in laudem Dei, exaltationem fidei et Divini cultus.” In 1529, when the full number of 18 Fellows had been attained, all were to be ultimately *Theologians*,—as was laid down by Bp. Longland, acting as Visitor in 1545: and again by Bp. Gibson, the great Canonist, in 1722. Queen Anne annexed a Canonry of Rochester to the Provostship for ever. . . . We of Oriel by the way, on our three Commemoration days, while thanking God for the advantages bestowed upon us by our Founder and Benefactors, pray that “we may never forget that it is our bounden duty so to employ them as we think they would approve, if they were now upon earth to witness what we do.” (See below, page 55.)—This College presents to 14 cures of souls.

Robert de Eglesfield (1340) says concerning QUEEN’s,—“fundavi . . . aulam quandam collegiarem Magistrorum, capellanorum, theologorum, et aliorum Scholarium ad ordinem Sacerdotii promovendorum. His fellows were to be at first 13,—“sub mysterio decursus Christi et Apostolorum in terris.” As vacancies occurred, they must be filled up by persons in Priests’ Orders, or who promised on oath to take Holy Orders immediately. This College presents to 28 cures of souls.

The Statutes of NEW (1400) begin by proclaiming the founder’s intention “ut Sacra Scriptura seu pagina, scientiarum omnium aliarum mater et domina, sua liberius et præ cæteris dilatet tentoria.” He designed to promote the other sciences and facul-

ties,—“*et, ut præcipue ferventius et frequentius Christus evangelizetur, et fides cultusque Divini Nominis augeatur et fortius sustentetur,—Sacra insuper Theologia: ut sic dilatetur laus Dei, gubernetur Ecclesia, rigor atque fervor Christianæ religionis calescant.*” The College presents to 41 cures of souls.

Thomas Rotheram, Bp. of Lincoln and afterwards Abp. of York, the second founder of LINCOLN COLL. (1479), “videntes” (as he says) “*piam intentionem Ricardi [Flemming] antecessoris nostri, esse ad laudem Dei, ad augmentum Cleri, et profectum universalis Ecclesiae,*”—proceeds to found “*quoddam Collegium Theologorum . . . pro destruendis hæresibus, et erroribus evel lendis, plantandisque Sacrae doctrinæ seminariis.*”—“*Statuimus insuper et inviolabiliter ordinamus quod nullus in nostri collegii collegam perpetuum admittatur, . . . nisi quod eligendus talis sit in Sacerdotio constitutus, vel ad minus infra annum immediate post electionem in Sacerdotio constitutus.*” All these must in due time graduate in Divinity. Chapters vii, viii, ix of the Statutes (“*De Sermibus dicendis,*” “*De Officio Divino et assignatione ad altaria,*” “*De suffragiis dicendis pro Fundatoribus et Benefactoribus,*”) bear eloquent witness to what was in the mind of the Founder. It was to be nothing else but a College of Priests. It still enjoys the Patronage of 9 cures of souls. . . . See more at p. 40.

Abp. Chicheley, founder of ALL SOULS (1443), assigns as his motive *the needs of the Clergy of his day*: “*Statuentes quod quilibet Magister in artibus, statim postquam necessariam regentiam compleverit, et tres annos ultra, ad facultatem Theologiae illico se convertere debeat et etiam teneatur.*” Also, “*quod Socius quilibet dicti Collegii, infra duos annos post regentiam suam . . . se ad sacerdotium . . . faciat promoveri.*” This College presents to 17 cures of souls.

William Waynflete, Bp. of Winchester (1479), founded MAGDALEN COLLEGE “*ad laudem, gloriam et honorem omnipotentis Dei, &c. extirpationem hæresium et errorum, augmentum Cleri, decorum sacrosanctæ matris Ecclesiae,*” &c. : (borrowing a sentence already quoted from the Oriel Statutes.) Over this “*Aula perpetua eruditio nis scientiarum sacrae Theologiae et Philosophiae*” was to be set “*persona Ecclesiastica in Præsidem.*” The founder aimed at “*sustentationem fidei Christianæ, Ecclesiæ profectum, Divini cultus, liberaliumque artium, scientiarum, et facultatum augmentum.*” Besides his 40 Fellows, who within a year of their regency were, with certain exceptions, to enter the Priesthood, he appointed twelve “*altaris et Capellæ [dicti Collegii] ministri, deservientes quotidie in eadem: quorum videlicet quatuor presbyteri, et octo clerici existant.*” The three Deans of his College were to be “*profectiores in Theologiâ.*” This College has the patronage of 41 cures of souls.

William Smyth, Bp. of Lincoln, and his co-founder of BRASENOSE (1521) announce that they aim “*ad sustentationem et exaltationem fidei Christianæ, Ecclesiæ sanctæ profectum, et Divini*

*cultus augmentum.*" Next, because "omnes et singuli in Sacra Theologiâ studere optantes, ex facultatibus scientiarum sophistriæ, logicæ, et philosophiæ florescunt," therefore they are solicitous for the prosecution of those other studies by their "scholares." The Principal must be a graduate in Divinity, or at least a Master of arts in Priests' Orders, "sacrae Theologiæ studio deditus." This College presents to 53 cures of souls.

Richard Fox, Bp. of Winchester (1517) founder of CORPUS, at the beginning of his Statutes is divided between the image of a ladder by which to mount up to Heaven; and a hive,—"in quo scholastici, veluti ingeniosæ apes, dies noctesque ad Dei honorem dulcisflua mella confiant ad universorum Christianorum commoditatem." He ordains that his Masters "ad ipsum Doctoratus sacrae Theologiæ gradum advolent," and shall preach Sermons in public, of which he specifies the occasions. Finally, "ne quisquam se a Dominico retrahat ministerio," every fellow of the College (save the one who might study Medicine) was required to take Holy Orders within a year of his regency. This College presents to 22 cures of souls.

Of CHRIST CHURCH (1532) it is sufficient to state that it is essentially a *Cathedral Foundation*. At the head of it is the Dean. Five of its Canons are Professors of *Divinity*: the fourth being the Archdeacon of Oxford. "In hoc Collegio nostro instituendo," (says its Founder,) "id unum spectaverunt cogitationes nostræ ut, ad illustrandam Divinæ Majestatis gloriam rectâ animorum institutione educata juventus, tum moribus tum literis eatenus proficiat ut non vitæ minus exemplo quem verâ et sincera Evangelii prædicatione fidem Christi Salvatoris simplicioribus animis commendare queat." The House enjoys the patronage of 93 cures of souls.

The founder of TRINITY (1554) aims at "orthodoxæ fidei Religionisque Christianæ incrementum." "Theologiæ studio singulos Artium Magistros statim post necessariam suam regentiam completam, sine temporis intervallo gnaviter animos intendere præcipio." The chapter (20) "De hæreticorum vitando consortio" ("Quum in votis semper habuerim sinceram Christi Religionem, ab omni hæreseos labo puram, Christi populo iri commendatum," &c.) leaves no doubt as to the spirit and intention of the Founder of Trinity. The College presents to 10 cures of souls.

St. JOHN'S was founded (1555) "ad honorem Sanctissimæ et individuæ Trinitatis . . . et ad totius cœlestis hierarchiæ gloriam, et ad Christianæ religionis augmentum." "Cum igitur" (says the pious founder) "instituti nostri sit orthodoxæ fidei et Christianæ professionis augmentum," &c. "ut Theologia, verbique Divini sincera prædicatio, mater ac Domina Scientiarum omnium, sua liberius latiusque germina emittat," &c. "Artium Magistri, omnes et singuli, tempore suæ necessariæ regentiaæ completo, statim ad sacram Theologiam se convertant." proceeding to the highest degree in Divinity. This College has the patronage of 32 cures of souls.

JESUS COLLEGE (1571) was founded “*ad summi et Omnipotentis Dei gloriam et honorem, ad Christianæ et sinceræ Religionis amplificationem, et stabilimentum, ad errorum et falsarum persuasiorum extirpationem, ad augendum et continuendum pietatis cultum.*” “Artium quoque Magistri, omnes et singuli, tempore necessariæ suæ regentiæ completo, statim ad sacram Theologiam se divertant: eidem tam diligentem exinde operam dantes, ut septimo post gradum Magisterii ademptum anno, ad baccalaureatum in Theologiâ, et exinde ad gradum Doctoris in eadem facultate admittantur, sub pœna amotionis a Collegio in perpetuum, nisi ex causa rationabili,” &c. This College presents to 19 cures of souls.

WADHAM (1612) is described as “quoddam *Collegium perpetuum Sacrae Theologiae,*” &c. The Warden must be a Doctor of Divinity. Masters must proceed either in the faculty of *Theology, Medicine, or Civil Law.* The College presents to 13 cures of souls.

The Statutes of PEMBROKE, which bear date 1629, require that “*Omnes Socii et Scholares sui ad studium Theologiae obligabuntur, et erunt presbyteri intra quatuor annos a gradu Magisterii in artibus suscepto. Nec manebunt in Collegio ultra viginti annos ab eodem gradu, nisi fuerint Theologiae baccalaurei.*” Thomas Teesdale’s seven Fellows are *all bound to take Holy Orders.* Queen Anne annexed a Canonry of Gloucester to the Mastership for ever. The College presents to 8 cures of souls.

WORCESTER COLLEGE, though not founded till 1714, retains the same character:—“*Quicunque sive in Socios sive in Scholares admittendi sunt, ex Ecclesia Anglicana sint: intra quatuor annos a gradu Magisterii suscepto, Sacris Ordinibus initientur, et post annum e diaconatu ad sacrum Presbyteratus ordinem promovantur. . . . Nec plures unquam eodem tempore quam duos in facultate alia quam Theologiae incipere permittimus.*” The College presents to 10 cures of souls.

But he who would understand to what an extent the *Religious* element pervades the Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford, must inspect those Statutes for himself. The constant requirement that the Bible shall be read during time of dinner,—(sometimes the portion so read being explained afterwards by one of the Fellows): the frequent provision made for holding Theological Disputations, or giving Divinity Lectures, in the Chapel: the duties of the “Catechist:” the provision for public Grace before meals,—for Prayers,—for the observance of Festival Days,—for the maintenance of the Choir, and for Divine worship generally:—these and many other like details, all point unmistakably in one direction, and prove uncontestedly that the pending Legislation is nothing else but a *reversal* of the Intentions of Founders and Benefactors. *Who* that surveys the foregoing extracts will deny that “THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION” in such Institutions as these, is “THE BETRAYAL OF A SACRED TRUST?”

## APPENDIX (E).

THE COLLEGES INTENDED FOR THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF  
LEARNING IN THE SONS OF POOR PARENTS.

*Referred to in p. 29.*

THE following notices on this subject, indicative of the intentions of Founders, are derived from a very cursory inspection of the Statutes. Such notices might be largely increased :—

“*Eos semper in Scholares Collegii eligi volumus*” (so run the Statutes of UNIVERSITY COLLEGE) “*qui sunt facultatibus pauperiores*. . . . The pious foundress of BALLIOL (1282) has a notable injunction :—“*Et ut melius provideatur sustentationi pauperum, ad quorum utilitatem intendimus laborare, volumus quod ditiores in societate Scholarium nostrorum ita temperate studeant vivere ut pauperes nullo modo graventur propter expensas onerosas*. ” The Statutes which till lately exclusively governed the society were those framed by the Bps. of Winchester and Carlisle in 1507. These provide that the Scholars shall wait on the Fellows at table, and “*de reliquiis mensæ Magistri et Sociorum vivant*,”—a sufficient indication of what must have been their condition. . . . The qualifications of the “Scholares” of EXETER are thus set down :—“*ad proficiendum aptiores, in moribus honestiores, et in facultatibus pauperiores*. ” . . . The following is the provision on this subject in the Statutes of ORIEL :—“*Hoc enim in eadem domo specialiter observari volumus, ut circa eos qui ad hujusmodi eleemosynæ participium admittendi fuerint diligentि solicitudine caveatur, ne qui præter,—humiles, indigentes, ad studium habiles, proficere volentes recipientur*. ” . . . The founder of QUEEN’S (1340) ordains,—“*Sint insuper semper in eadem aula pauperes juvenes in subduplo numero ad maximum numerum parem Scholarium in eadem pro tunc existentium: ita quod numerus eorumdem pauperum septuaginta duorum Christi discipulorum non excedat*. ” “*Pauperes tales nominari volo et assumi juxta formam electionis Sociorum, ita tamen quod indigentes de meā parentela vel consanguinitate, et de locis ubi beneficia dictae aulæ consistunt, cæteris præferantur*. ” The regulations concerning these poor boys fill several pages of the Statutes. . . . William of Wykeham (1400) speaks of NEW COLLEGE, as consisting “*in et de numero unius Custodis ac septuaginta pauperum indigentium Scholarium clericorum*. ” . . . So Abp. Chicheley (1443) describes ALL SOULS as “*unum Collegium pauperum ac indigentium Scholarium, clericorum*. ” . . . MAGDALEN COLLEGE was intended to be “*perpetuum Collegium pauperum et indigentium Scholarium, clericorum*. ” Over and above these,—“*sint alii triginta pauperes Scholares, vulgariter Demyes nuncupati*. ” . . . TRINITY was

founded (1556) "ad perpetuam pauperum Scholarium in Academiâ degentium sustentationem." "Tum quod in omnibus, et super omnia, paupertati faveatur, ita ut ita tantum ad hujus eleemosynæ participationem admittantur, qui inopiâ pressi, unde vivant, seque in bonarum literarum studiis sustentent, non habent: et omni fere amicorum ope destituti esse cognoscuntur." . . . The founder of S. JOHN'S COLLEGE (1555) declares that—"quia Christus præcipit pauperes recipere in hospitia, nos ordinamus et volumus quod omnes in collegium nostrum ad annos probationis eligendi, sint pauperes et indigentes scholares, clerici." Accordingly he provides an endowment for 50 "scholares pauperiores." . . . The expression recurs in the Statutes of PEMBROKE with reference to Thomas Teesdale's foundation (1629). His scholars were to be "ex pauperioribus." . . . JESUS COLLEGE (1571) was founded (*inter alia*) "ad pauperum et inopiâ afflictorum sublevationem." . . . WADHAM is described (1612) as "aliquid Collegium pauperum et indigentium Scholarium."

Let me refer here to two Pamphlets by my friend and late brother-Fellow, Dr. Chase, Principal of S. Mary Hall, who has ever been the firm and consistent champion of the "Pauperes Scholares,"—the faithful advocate of the claims of *Poverty* on our Collegiate Foundations:—(1) *A Plea for John Lord Craven, and the Eleemosynary purpose of Founders generally [n. d.]*:—(2) *The Rights of 'Indigentes' in respect to College Foundations*, A Letter to Sir J. Packington, 1856. . . . I have also before me some prophetic words of his in a short pamphlet entitled *The De-Christianizing of the Colleges of Oxford*, reprinted from the "Standard" of Oct. 27, 1868. Dr. Chase begins,—"THE EFFECT, WHATEVER MAY BE THE INTENTION, OF MR. [now Lord Chief Justice] COLERIDGE'S BILL, should it pass into an Act, CAN BE, under the present circumstances of the University, NOTHING LESS THAN THE DE-CHRISTIANIZING OF THE COLLEGES OF OXFORD."—A truer sentence was never penned.

## APPENDIX (F).

### THE PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF THE OXFORD PROFESSORIATE.

*Referred to at pp. 31 and 34.*

THE reader is invited to inquire for a "Return" made on the subject of *Professors* and *Professorial Lectures*, by order of the House of Commons, and ordered to be printed 11 July, 1876. It is certainly little calculated to stimulate the founding of additional Professorships,—certainly not the increasing of the actual emoluments of Professors.

It would be interesting to ascertain how many of our existing

staff could occasionally count their auditory on the fingers of one hand.

May I be allowed to point out that the creating of berths of £900 a-year for men, respectable indeed, but who have as yet achieved for themselves no manner of celebrity,—(and this I am afraid is the intention of the Commissioners),—is an indefensible waste of Collegiate funds, and what, anywhere but in Oxford, would be called—a job?

It has ever seemed to me that the true way to enlarge the University Professoriate is not to go on founding additional Professorships in perpetuity, in departments which are already sufficiently represented; (as Greek and Latin for example, and certainly Mathematics); but to *create a Chair* for any one who has already made himself illustrious, or who at least is achieving for himself a reputation in any department of Human Learning; and to endow it liberally *pro hac vice*, according to the peculiar requirements of the individual case. After the man's death, discontinue the endowment, and let the Chair itself cease,—unless indeed (which is by no means likely) there be some one at hand confessedly competent to sustain the reputation of his predecessor.

Absolutely fatal to any man's usefulness *as a Professor*, is the prevailing imagination that he must be required to lecture three times a-week,—to examine his pupils,—to report upon their progress, &c., &c. All this is not for *a Professor*, but for *a College Tutor*: and for such work, one third of £900 is quite adequate remuneration.... To extend the limits of his own special Science;—to break up fresh ground;—to plant his foot where none ever planted foot before;—and then, from time to time, to communicate to mankind the result of his many days and nights of unremitting toil in a department which cannot be made remunerative,—probably by a book which shall make his University famous wherever learned men abide:—this, *this* is the proper business of a Professor: *not*, certainly, to teach boys Greek and Latin, and to correct their exercises. What else can possibly be the result of this latter course but that Oxford Scholarship should fall into disrepute, as since Dean Gaisford's death it has done, all over Europe?

*Infinitely better than founding new Professorships of £900 a-year, WHICH ARE NOT WANTED,—would be the creation of a vast number of Exhibitions of the yearly value of £50, tenable for 4 years, to enable "Poor Scholars" to be educated at any of the Colleges of Oxford.*

*PRAYER used on Commemoration Days in O'RIEL COLLEGE, viz.*

*On the Feast of the Purification: Within eight Days after  
Easter: Within eight Days after October 10<sup>th</sup>:—*

WE glorify Thy Name, O LORD ALMIGHTY and Father of mercies, for all the good which Thou hast done unto us of this place, by the hands of Thy servants King Edward the Second our Founder, Adam de Brome, and all other our Benefactors; humbly praying Thee to give us grace to make right use and improvement of this Thy bounty, and of their charity towards us. Bless all the families and persons which are descended from them. Give them of the dew of Heaven, and of the fatness of the Earth: and bring them by Thy mercy to everlasting happiness in Thy heavenly Kingdom.

And while we thus offer unto Thee the sacrifice of our praise and thanksgiving for the advantages they have bestowed upon us, *may we never forget that IT IS OUR BOUNDEN DUTY SO TO EMPLOY THEM, AS WE THINK THEY WOULD APPROVE, IF THEY WERE NOW UPON EARTH TO WITNESS WHAT WE DO.* Bless, O Lord, this College, that it may ever be *what they intended it should be, A NURSERY OF PIETY, learning, sobriety, and all kinds of virtues.* Bless the persons and assist the honest endeavours of all who belong to it. SANCTIFY OUR STUDIES, THAT THEY MAY TEND TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF THY GLORY, IN THE PROPAGATION OF THE TRUTH OF THY GOSPEL, IN THE EDIFYING OF THY CHURCH, *in the benefit of our brethren, and the comfort and salvation of our souls.*

Grant, we beseech Thee, that as we increase in years we may increase in wisdom, and in favour with Thee and with men. *Keep us evermore in Thy fear and obedience, that we, together with Thy Saints that are gone before us, may at last be made partakers of Thy glorious resurrection to life eternal, through the infinite merits of CHRIST our only SAVIOUR and REDEEMER.* Amen.









